DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 451 EA 006 293

TITLE	Administrator Evaluation. The Best of ERIC Series, Number 1.
INSTITUTION	Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 74
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080353-3514
NOTE	4p.
AVAILABLE FROM	ERIC/CEM, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403 (Free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Evaluation; *Administrator Guides; *Annotated Bibliographies; Evaluation; *Evaluation Techniques; Performance; *Performance Criteria; Principals; Superintendents

ABSTRACT

This bibliography presents 23 annotated citations of documents and journal articles in the ERIC system dealing with various aspects of administrator evaluation. Materials range from overviews of current administrator evaluation philosophy and practice through manuals and guides for the evaluation of the performance of principals and superintendents. (WM)

ED 094451

The Best of ERIC

Clearinghouse on Educational Management

Number 1 September 1974

The Best of ERIC presents annotations of ERIC literature on important topics in educational management. The selections are intended to give the practicing educator easy access to the most significant and useful information available from ERIC. Because of space limitations, the items listed should be viewed as representative, rather than exhaustive, of literature meeting those criteria.

Materials were selected for inclusion from the ERIC catalogs *Resources in Education (RIE)* and *Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE)*.

Administrator Evaluation

Andrews, Richard L. *The Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory. Preliminary Manual.* Seattle: Bureau of School Service and Research, University of Washington, 1970. 16 pages. ED 050 458 Document not available from EDRS. (Available from Bureau of School Service and Research, 126 Lewis Annex, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98105. $1.00.)

In designing his 64-item inventory, Andrews has defined administrator effectiveness as behavior that meets the expectations held for his performance. His approach incorporates the subjective reactions of evaluators toward the evaluatee, requiring them "to make qualitative judgments and express feelings and perceptions about the principal's effectiveness." His inventory covers such areas as school-community relations, administration-staff relations, attitudes toward change, management of resources, and so forth.

Barraclough, Terry. *Administrator Evaluation.* NAESP School Leadership Digest Series, Number Five. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1974 (prepared by ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon). (Available only as a series of 13 reports from National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209. $24.00 plus postage.)

In this analysis of the research, Barraclough offers a well-organized, clearly written overview of current administrator evaluation philosophy and practice. Summarizing two general evaluation approaches—the performance standards approach and the job targets approach—he concludes that the latter offers the most valid means of evaluating administrators.

Barraclough, Terry. *Administrator Evaluation. Educational Management Review Series Number 15.* Eugene: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1973. 10 pages. ED 074 588 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

EA 006 293

Barraclough's concise review of the literature provides a convenient introduction to administrator evaluation. Noting that "evaluation of administrative personnel is a relatively recent development in the history of education," he concludes that the philosophies and procedures of this kind of evaluation are somewhat "underdeveloped." He points out that evaluation on the basis of performance (as opposed to "subjective standards") is more relevant to the accomplishment of educational goals, as well as "more humane" to the administrator.

Beall, Lewis L. "Case Study No 7: Evaluating the Principal." *Thrust for Education Leadership*, 2, 2 (November 1972), pp. 36-39.

Can pupil progress be used as a legitimate basis for principal evaluation? According to Beall's account of the principal evaluation process for Azusa Unified School District (California), pupil progress can be a valuable evaluative measure if it is used in the correct manner. He maintains that measures of student achievement should be employed only as "a constructive lever to influence improvement rather than as an axe for cutting." He notes that it is ridiculous to use student progress "as a tool for cutting out the deadwood or releasing principals."

Beall's article offers an intelligent examination of the oft-times ambiguous issue of the relationship between administrator evaluation and student achievement.

Brick, Michael, and Sanchis, Robert. "Evaluating the Principal." *Thrust for Education Leadership*, 2, 1 (October 1972), pp. 32-37. EJ 068 044.

Brick and Sanchis summarize the results of a study measuring the effectiveness of the management by objectives approach in principal performance and evaluation. Focusing on the community information program for their school district (Fountain Valley, California), six principals set objectives to be achieved in increasing community knowledge of the schools.

The kind of evaluation procedure recommended by Brick and Sanchis is concerned with "outcome" instead of "process." Emphasis on outcome is essential if demands for accountability are to be met, according to these authors.

Campbell, Roald F. "The Evaluation of Administrative Performance." Paper presented at American Association of School Administrators annual convention, Atlantic City, February 1971. 12 pages. ED 050 452 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Campbell offers a well-organized discussion of some of the problems of administrator performance evaluation, as well as outlining the concepts with which such evaluation should be concerned and the means for implementing those concepts. According to Campbell, many conflicting ideas ("differential role perceptions") exist concerning the functions of the administrator. He lists five administrative "functions" upon which performance may be evaluated: definition of goals and purposes, programs, staffing, resources, and evaluation. These functions should be defined in "behavioral" terms, and Campbell provides good specific examples of appropriate "behaviors" for each function.

Carvell, James. "Case Study No. 6: Evaluating Administrative Performance." *Thrust for Education Leadership*, 2, 2 (November 1972), pp. 31-35. EJ 071 421.

Carvell's rather flamboyantly written description of his district's principal evaluation process presents some of the psychological factors influencing current administrator evaluation. He points out that principals tend to look with suspicion upon evaluation. However, "With a sweating hand grasping the Maalox it must be admitted that it is reasonable and equitable for administrators to be evaluated with the performance outcome model used for teachers."

The evaluation process that he recommends includes a battery of objective tests to provide "a conglomerate of multidimensional data." A wide variety of data is necessary, Carvell maintains, because "no one form, instrument, observation or technique could adequately fill the assessment needs." The evaluation process must be conducted in an atmosphere of mutual trust and constructiveness to overcome the "institutional paranoia" experienced by both the evaluatee and the evaluators.

Castetter, William B., and Heisler, Richard S. *Appraising and Improving the Performance of School Administrative Personnel.* Philadelphia: Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 1971. 82 pages. ED 060 540 MF $0.75 HC not available from EDRS. (Available from Center for Field Studies, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104. $5.00.)

In this exhaustive examination of the concepts and implementation of performance appraisal, these authors provide a historical context in which to view the development of such appraisal in the schools. They outline the weaknesses of past appraisal plans and concisely portray the conceptual development culminating in the management by objectives theory.

The "appraisal process" outlined by Castetter and Heisler includes a preappraisal conference, the establishment of performance targets, appraisal of performance, a postappraisal progress review conference, and the "recycling" of performance (the selection of new targets after the old ones have been carried out).

DeVaughn, J. Everette. *Policies, Procedures and Instruments in Evaluation of Teacher and Administrator Performance.* Atlanta: Davis (Robert) Associates, Inc., 1971. 23 pages. ED 061 607 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

DeVaughn concentrates on the legal aspects of the evaluation of educational personnel, including administrators and teachers. He points out that an adequate evaluation procedure guarantees the rights of individual administrators and provides the school with a firm legal basis for its personnel decisions (including promotion, dismissal, and so forth). Such a procedure can prevent "capricious, arbitrary, or discriminatory" personnel practices.

Although his paper is rather poorly written, his synopsis of the law cases dealing with evaluation of educational personnel is thorough and provides necessary legal information for those setting up an evaluation procedure.

Educational Research Service. *Evaluating Administrative Performance. ERS Circular Number 7.* Washington, D.C., 1968. 58 pages. ED 032 635 MF $0.75 HC $3.15.

This ERS survey of 157 school systems provides a concise outline of administrator evaluation trends across the country. Although some of its statistics are now outdated, this paper still offers a valuable summary of the methods and purposes of evaluation systems.

Hoffner, James R. "Case Study No. 8A: Evaluation of Superintendent (A Means for Survival)." *Thrust for Education Leadership*, 2, 2 (November 1972), pp. 40-41. EJ 071 423.

Hoffner outlines the performance evaluation process for the Santa Clara Unified School District (California), listing position description, role expectations, and management by objectives as three criteria for superintendent evaluation.

For the evaluation process to be truly effective, it must include (1) written evaluation of subordinate by superior, (2) written evaluation of superior by subordinate, and (3) self evaluation.

Although brief, Hoffner's article is well organized and easy to read.

Ingraham, William W., and Keefe, John E. "Values of Management by Objectives." *School Management*, 16, 6 (June 1972), pp. 28-29. EJ 060 383.

In order to measure administrator performance and to encourage administrator self-appraisal, the Pennsbury, Pennsylvania, School District instigated an evaluation program based on management by objectives. Ingraham and Keefe summarize the purposes and implementation of this evaluation process.

All the administrators involved in this program (from assistant principals on up) list the goals that they intend to achieve in the coming school year. These goals must be objectively measurable "in terms of facts and figures," and they must not be "philosophical or intangible." The authors list four types of goals (individual, organization, joint performance, and district goals) that the individual administrator may set in conjunction with his superior(s). Monthly progress reports indicate whether the administrator is succeeding in carrying out these goals.

HOW TO ORDER ERIC REPORTS

Copies of most ERIC reports, but not journal articles, can be ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. If a report is available from EDRS, its order number and prices are given. When ordering, please specify the "ED" number. Unless otherwise noted, reports are available in both microfiche (MF) and Xerox copy (HC). All orders must be in writing, and payment must accompany orders of less than $10.

Postage must be added to the cost of all orders. Weights for determining the amount of postage are as follows: 96 pages = 1 microfiche, 35 microfiche = 1 pound, and 100 hard copy pages = 1 pound. Book rate costs $0.18 for first pound, $0.08 per additional ½ pound or part thereof. First class or air mail postage is available at additional cost.

Address requests to ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Computer Microfilm International Corporation, P. O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210.

Lamb, Joseph P. "Gleanings from the Private Sector." Paper presented at Institute of Field Studies seminar, Spring Valley, New York, December 1972. New York: Institute of Field Studies, Columbia University. 26 pages. ED 071 194 MF $0.75 HC $1.85.

Focusing on superintendent evaluation by the school board, Lamb recommends the use of a management by objectives type of evaluation that stresses "administrative outcomes" or results, instead of personality traits. Under management by objectives, the school board and the superintendent share the same basic goal improvement of education. The superintendent knows ahead of time what his goals are, and what he must do to accomplish them.

Lamb's paper is well written and easy to read. Because of his familiarity with personnel practices in business, his perspective is refreshingly different.

McCleary, Lloyd E. *Competency Based Educational Administration and Applications to Related Fields.* 1973. 10 pages. ED 077 136 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

The concept of competency is as essential to educational administration as it is to other professions, according to McCleary. And the relationship of competency to administrator evaluation is clear: What constitutes competency must be determined before evaluation can take place. McCleary outlines a model for "competency-based administrative development" and presents the means for defining competencies. His system would generate the information necessary to the evaluation process.

McCleary's model incorporates rather sophisticated analytical concepts, and his paper may not be easy to read for those unfamiliar with his jargon.

Melton, George E., and others. *The Principalship: Job Specifications and Salary Considerations for the 70's.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970. 70 pages. ED 040 492 MF $0.75 HC not available from EDRS. (Available from National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1904 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091. $2.00.)

The second section of this paper deals with administrator evaluation—specifically with the "job-targets" method. Bernstein and Sawyer (the authors of this chapter) point out the disadvantages of what they call "task-performance criteria" for evaluation, stating that this approach deals only with routine administrative functions. On the other hand, the job-targets approach allows the evaluative process to encompass "the long-range issues of school improvement" and to specify the administrator's ability to deal with the unforseen situations that often constitute the most demanding aspects of his job.

Bernstein and Sawyer back up their theory with good concrete examples of job-targets and how to achieve them.

Nicholson, Everett W. "The Performance of Principals in the Accountability Syndrome." Paper presented at National Association of Secondary School Principals annual convention, Anaheim, California, March 1972. 14 pages. ED 063 626 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

The "accountability syndrome," according to Nicholson, is placing increasing pressure on principals to justify their performance of administrative duties. This pressure for accountability means a corresponding emphasis on evaluation.

Nicholson recommends that principals develop "performance objectives" and acquire the technical skills necessary to analyze administrative performance. These objectives must be constantly refined and modified "in order to maintain viability and keep ahead of the crowd . . ."

Although this paper contains a valuable analysis of some of the factors influencing evaluation, its language is rather technical for the layman.

Pharis, William L. "The Evaluation of School Principals." *National Elementary Principal,* 52, 5 (February 1973), pp. 36-38. EJ 077 763.

"Evaluation should be a matching of intent to results, a comparison of what was expected to happen with what did happen." According to Pharis, this goal of administrator evaluation is infrequently realized under many current evaluation procedures. These methods tend to emphasize past performance instead of future activity; hence they fail to encourage administrative improvement.

Pharis condemns the use of checklist instruments in evaluation because they embody this weakness and because the scales by which the administrator is rated are arbitrary. The data generated by these instruments are essentially subjective and "characterized by sweeping generalizations whose interpretation is more witchcraft than science." Instead of this type of instrument, Pharis recommends the job targets approach—"a personalized adaptation of the management by objectives approach."

Pharis' article is inteiligently written and offers a well-thought-out critique of administrator evaluation procedures.

Poliakoff, Lorraine. "Recent Trends in Evaluating School Personnel." *National Elementary Principal,* 52, 5 (February 1973), pp. 39-44. EJ 077 764.

In her analysis of the evolution of education personnel evaluation, Poliakoff notes the increasing prevalence of the job targets approach. The growing desire for evaluatee participation in the evaluation process is met by the job targets method—an approach that accommodates the evaluatee's "needs and rights as a professional and human being."

Her article is well researched and her analysis basically sound. But her style of writing is unneccessarily dense and academic.

Redfern, George B. "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them, Why, and How?" Paper presented at National Association of Secondary School Principals annual convention, Anaheim, California, March 1972. 10 pages. ED 062 693 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Redfern's outline of administrator evaluation is easily readable, though brief. His version of the evaluation process includes eight steps: (1) *Job understanding*—the administrator must know what is expected of him; (2) definition of *standards of excellence*—stated in terms as "concrete" as possible; (3) definition of *performance objectives*—the "specific targets" on the road to achieving standards of excellence; (4) *program of action*—how performance objectives are to be achieved; (5) *self-assessment;* (6) *assessment by evaluator;* (7) *evaluation conference;* (8) *follow-up*—the action resulting from evaluation.

Rosenberg, Max. "The Values of School Principal Evaluation." *Education,* 91, 3 (February-March 1971), pp. 212-214. EJ 003 258.

Rosenberg outlines the theory behind principal evaluation and states concisely why such evaluation is important. The school principal, he argues, holds "the most strategic position in the educational system." Since he is the administrator closest to students and teachers, adequate evaluation of his performance is essential.

Rosenberg emphasizes the importance of an evaluation program based on "actual on-the-job behaviors," not on "theoretical tests of ability or knowledge." Principal evaluation should be oriented toward improved performance in the future, not toward penalization for past failures.

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. ERIC serves educators by disseminating research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of several such units in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in Resources in Education (RIE), available in many libraries and by subscription for $38 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Journal articles are announced in Current Index to Journals in Education. CIJE is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $44 a year from CCM Information Corporation, 866 Third Avenue, Room 1126, New York, New York 10022.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, monographs, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Association of California School Administrators for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Association of California School Administrators or the National Institute of Education.

Rosenberg, Max. "How To Evaluate Your Principals Without Scaring (or Turning) Them Off." *American School Board Journal*, 160, 6 (June 1973), pp. 35-36. EJ 077 234.

Specific suggestions on how to set up a performance-based principal evaluation program abound in this concise and lucid article. Rosenberg emphasizes that the purpose of principal evaluation is "to guide and counsel," not to "check up" on the evaluatee.

To accomplish this goal, he outlines seven steps: First, the principal must evaluate his own behavior and experience. Next, a panel should conduct a follow-up evaluation to "check on the subjective interpretations supplied by the principal." Criteria for both the self-evaluation and the follow-up evaluation should center around "nine areas of principal performance," including school organization; instructional program; schedules, accounts, and other management matters; relationships with students, staff, community, and superiors; facilities; and finally, "school climate."

After these criteria are outlined, evidence of the principal's performance within these areas must be collected. Finally, the evaluators should summarize the principal's performance in each of the nine areas and should provide "counseling action that is tailored to the specific needs of each principal."

Turner, Loyd L. "Your Superintendent: When To Recharge Him—or Discharge Him." *American School Board Journal*, 159, 1 (July 1971), pp. 16-19. EJ 040 715.

Turner outlines the superintendent evaluation process utilized by the Ft. Worth, Texas, school board. The board members rank their superintendent according to 21 "qual:"cations," including "high moral character," "pleasing personal appearance," "ability to organize," and so forth. The board bases its decision to "reward, recharge, or discharge" the superintendent on the results of this checklist.

It would seem that this method of evaluation embodies all the weaknesses of checklist instruments (subjectivity, lack of specificity, emphasis on past instead of future performance) outlined by Pharis, Barraclough, and others. But Turner's article is a good description of this prevalent type of evaluation.

"A Word of Warning." *School Management*, 16, 6 (June 1972), p. 29.

According to this brief article, which summarizes comments by Thorne Hacker of the Midwest Administration Center, school districts should use caution in adopting management by objectives techniques for personnel evaluation. Hacker maintains that MBO can lead the administrator to select only easily realizable goals and cause him to neglect the more complex and not-so-easily-measurable aspects of administration. To help remedy this difficulty, MBO should be used in conjunction with other performance criteria.

Hacker's words of caution are valuable to those educators (perhaps including Ingraham and Keefe) who would embrace MBO as a cure-all for administrator evaluation ills.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403